Applicant : Mehdi Hassane
Serial No. : 10/748,693
Filed : December 29, 2003
Page : 9 of 10

Attorney Docket: 10559-911001 / P18021

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

> **4. Claims 1-22 are objected to because of the following informalities:**
> **a. With respect to claims 1 and 18, the last paragraph is difficult to understand. The lack of punctuation between the words 'set' and 'with' in the 3rd to last lines contributes to it. In addition to adding a comma or semicolon, the examiner suggests putting the limitation starting with, "with the data used to ..." in a separate paragraph.**
> **b. With respect to claim 15, in the second line, the phrase, "after to using," should be replaced with, "after using."**
> **c. The claims not specifically mentioned are objected to because of their dependencies. Appropriate correction is required.**

Claims 1, 15, and 18 have been amended.

> **5. Claims 23-35 are allowed.**
> **6. Claims 1-22 are allowable if rewritten to overcome their respective objections.**
> **7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:**
> **d. With respect to claims 1-22, specifically independent claims 1 and 18, the prior art fails to teach of filling a cache set of a cache memory with data associated with addresses in a main memory that correspond to the cache set either after the first processor writes a unit of data to addresses that correspond to the cache set, or before the first processor reads a unit of data written by the second processor to addresses that correspond to the cache set; where the data used to fill the cache set is associated with addresses that are *different* from the addresses associated with the unit of data.**
> **e. With respect to claims 23-35, specifically independent claims 23, 28, and 31, the prior art fails to teach of the first processor generating dummy read instructions either after generating one or more write instructions to write data intended for the second processor, or before generating one or more read instructions to read data that was written by the second processor.**

The applicant thanks the examiner for allowing claims 23-35, and indicating allowance of claims 1-22 if rewritten to overcome the objections.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any

Applicant : Mehdi Hassane   Attorney Docket: 10559-911001 / P18021
Serial No. : 10/748,693
Filed   : December 29, 2003
Page   : 10 of 10

circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____1/30/2006_____   _____Rex Khuang_____

                                        Rex L Huang
                                        Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21252125.doc